



1313 North Market Street
P.O. Box 951
Wilmington, DE 19899-0951
302 984-6000

www.potteranderson.com

Richard L. Horwitz
Partner
Attorney at Law
rhorwitz@potteranderson.com
302 984-6027 Direct Phone
302 658-1192 Fax

August 21, 2006

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING
AND HAND DELIVERY

The Honorable Joseph J. Farnan, Jr.
United States District Court
for the District of Delaware
844 King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801

Re: Nokia Corporation and Nokia, Inc. v. QUALCOMM Incorporated
C. A. No. 06-509 (JJF)

Dear Judge Farnan:

I write on behalf of QUALCOMM to reply briefly to Nokia's opposition to QUALCOMM's motion to have the parties brief on the same schedule the pending motions to remand and to transfer. In order to have this issue fully briefed as soon as possible for Your Honor's consideration, I will not engage in a point by point refutation of all of the statements made in Nokia's opposition.

It is Nokia -- and not QUALCOMM -- that has put "the cart before the horse" in this action. The claims in this action are nothing more than recast affirmative defenses in the earlier-filed San Diego action. Moreover, because resolution of these claims requires the interpretation and application of U.S. patents -- including some of those at issue in the San Diego action -- this case not only arises under the United States patent laws, but also belongs in San Diego.

Nokia should not be heard to complain about the stay in place in the San Diego action, since the stay was entered at Nokia's request. QUALCOMM is prepared to go forward in California. Moreover, the stay in that action was entered pending an appeal of the San Diego court's denial of Nokia's motion to stay the San Diego action pending arbitration. That appeal has been briefed and argued to the Federal Circuit, and a decision is expected soon. Nor should Nokia be heard to complain about any potential stay until the completion of the ITC investigation. Again, any such stay was requested by Nokia, see 28 U.S.C. 1659, and QUALCOMM is prepared to go forward. It is Nokia that is attempting to delay resolution in the proper forum of QUALCOMM's claims and these affirmative defenses and is now using that self-created delay as a basis for forum shopping.

The Honorable Joseph J. Farnan, Jr.

August 21, 2006

Page 2

On the legal arguments, QUALCOMM's position is that it makes sense for this Court to consider the remand and transfer motions at the same time, since both relate to where the issues in this case will ultimately be resolved. Contrary to Nokia's assertions, it is not unusual for Your Honor to resolve these types of motions as suggested by QUALCOMM, since this Court handled similar motions in exactly this way in Bank of America N.A. (USA) v. US Airways, Inc., et al, C.A. No. 05-793-JJF (Dec. 21, 2005), where the Court was faced with an expedited motion to remand and a motion to transfer.

Contrary to the impression Nokia attempts to create, there is nothing nefarious about QUALCOMM's suggestion - - it is an attempt to efficiently deal with competing motions that are before the Court.

Counsel are available at the Court's convenience if Your Honor has any questions.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Richard L. Horwitz

Richard L. Horwitz

/msb
746848

cc: Clerk of the Court (via hand delivery)
Steven J. Fineman (via electronic filing) (via hand delivery)